

REMARKS

Summary

This Amendment is responsive to the final Office Action mailed on July 30, 2003. Claims 1 and 46 are amended herein. Claims 1-96 are pending.

As a preliminary matter, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courteous and productive telephone interview held on October 3, 2003.

Claims 1-4, 6, 12-34, 39-49, 51, 57-79, and 84-96 stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Motegi (US 6,307,640) and Savitzky (US 6,012,083).

Claims 5, 35-38, 50 and 80-83 stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Motegi, Savitzky, and Newton (US 6,334,142).

Claims 7-11 and 52-56 stand rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Motegi, Savitzky, and Pearson (US 6,023,684).

Applicants respectfully traverse the foregoing rejections in view of the amended claims and the following comments.

Discussion of Amended Claims

Claims 1 and 46 are amended to clarify that the polling request is automatically forwarded from the printer polling device to the spooling server.

As discussed with the Examiner on October 3, 2003, the term "polling" as used in Applicants' claims and the specification inherently denotes an automatic process. Therefore, The Examiner agreed that the present amendments to claims 1 and 46 merely serve to clarify the existing claim language.

Further, during the October 3, 2003 telephone conference,

Applicants' undersigned counsel pointed out to the Examiner that the Motegi reference required user interaction (i.e., entry of a password and/or a job number) at the printer before a document could be sent to the printer and printed. In contrast, with Applicants' claimed invention, no user interaction at the printer end is required, as the polling request is automatically forwarded from the printer polling device to the spooling server.

The Examiner agreed that the claims as amended herein distinguish over the Motegi reference. Accordingly, the Examiner has agreed to withdraw the Motegi reference upon entry of this Amendment. However, the Examiner has reserved the right to conduct a further search of the prior art.


Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is therefore respectfully requested, together with a withdrawal of the final Office Action.

Further remarks regarding the asserted relationship between Applicants' claims and the prior art are not deemed necessary, in view of the amended claims and the above discussion. Applicants' silence as to any of the Examiner's comments is not indicative of an acquiescence to the stated grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider this application, allow each of the presently pending claims, and to pass this application on to an early issue. If there are any remaining issues that need to be addressed in order to place this application into condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas M. McAllister
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 37,886
Law Office of Barry R. Lipsitz
755 Main Street
Monroe, CT 06468
(203) 459-0200

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: MGI-177

Date: October 3, 2003